

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 MONTGOMERY CARL AKERS,
8 Plaintiff,
9 v.
10 BETH LABSON-FREEMAN, et al.,
11 Defendants.

Case No. 23-cv-04221-JSC

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION, REVOKING
LEAVE TO PROCEED IN FORMA
PAUPERIS, AND DISMISSING CASE**

Re: Dkt. No. 24

12 **INTRODUCTION**

13 Plaintiff, a federal prisoner at the United States Penitentiary in Marion, Georgia (“USP
14 Marion”), who is proceeding without representation by an attorney, filed this civil rights case. He
15 was granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis (“IFP”) as well as leave to amend. (ECF Nos. 7,
16 8.)¹ Thereafter, the Court ordered Plaintiff “to either (1) pay the filing fee, or (2) show cause why
17 leave to proceed IFP should not be revoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g),” and cautioned him
18 that “[h]is failure to do so will result in the dismissal of this case without prejudice to re-filing in a
19 new action in which he pays the filing fee.” (ECF No. 23 (“OSC”) at 1:16-19.) Now before the
20 Court are Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration of the OSC (ECF No. 24) and his response to the
21 OSC (ECF No. 25). For the reasons discussed below, the motion for reconsideration is DENIED,
22 leave to proceed IFP is REVOKED, and the case is DISMISSED without prejudice.

23 **BACKGROUND**

24 The Court set forth the relevant background in the OSC:

25 The amended complaint names the following Defendants:
26 United States District Judge Edward Chen, United States District
27 Judge Beth Labson-Freeman, Katherine Siereveld, Jamie Conover,
28

¹ Record citations are to material in the Electronic Case File (“ECF”); specific page citations are to the ECF-generated page numbers at the top of the documents.

1 Kathy S. Hill, and Nathan Simpkins.² (ECF No. 22 at 1-3.)

2 Plaintiff alleges in 2010 Siereveld began “contacting” his
3 “relations . . . in order to destroy his ability to obtain the services of
4 his friends, lawyers, or any support persons” and “illegally access[ed]
5 his] financial and real property” located in this district. (ECF No. 22
6 at 5.) Plaintiff alleges Siereveld “ma[d]e sure” Plaintiff could not
7 “access his legitimate financial and real or business property by
8 fabricating misconduct [and] incident reports through Defendants []
9 Conover and [] Hill so that Plaintiff [] would have no access to
10 phone, mail, or email access with the public in order to transact his
11 financial needs, including paying filing fees in the courts so his
12 cases would be dismissed.” (*Id.* at 6.) When Plaintiff “legally
13 redressed these violations,” he “was retaliated against by being
14 threatened with bodily harm.” (*Id.*) Plaintiff alleges Siereveld
15 “subjected him to physical and psychological torture by destroying
16 his contacts within the community and fabricating conduct on his
17 part as a ‘terrorist.’ Each time Siereveld contacts relations of
18 Plaintiff[] they are told he is a terrorist.” (*Id.* at 9.)

19 Plaintiff also alleges Defendants Siereveld, Conover,
20 Simpkins, and Hill “devis[ed] schemes that are intended to cause
21 Plaintiff bodily harm.” (*Id.* at 7:5-6.) He alleges Simpkins and Hill
22 “ha[ve] been instrumental” in “trying to make sure that Plaintiff’s
23 medication is not given to him” and “that he will be denied
24 emergency care for his condition, atrial fibrillation;” and “tried to
25 orchestrate” his “assault[] by U.S. Marshal personnel” at is prison.
26 (*Id.* at 7:6-11.) He also alleges Siereveld, Conover, Simpkins, and
27 Hill were involved in a “scheme” to “restrict his access to the
28 courts” by returning and not delivering mail sent to him from the
court. (*Id.* at 7:13-21.)

29 Plaintiff alleges Siereveld, beginning in 2021, “contacted
30 judges in the Northern District of California including Magistrate
31 Judge Kandis Westmore in order to influence the court and
32 ‘railroad’ [him] out of court.” (*Id.* at 5.) The other judges Siereveld
33 allegedly contacted were Judge Chen and Judge Freeman. (*Id.*)
34 Plaintiff alleges Siereveld told these judges: Plaintiff “was
35 challenging a malicious prosecution in Kansas,” should not “be
36 allowed to overturn his case,” is a “terrorist and we are doing all we
37 can to charge him with new crimes,” and she (Siereveld) “arranged
38 with” Defendants Hill and Simpkins “to take care of [Plaintiff]
39 inside of prison one way or another.” (*Id.*) Plaintiff claims
40 Siereveld spoke to Judges Chen and Freeman to “secure their
41 cooperation” and “to impede” him from bringing “the truth of his
42 wrongful conviction.” (*Id.* at 6.)

43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
8010
8011
8012
8013
8014
8015
8016
8017
8018
8019
8020
8021
8022
8023
8024
8025
8026
8027
8028
8029
8030
8031
8032
8033
8034
8035
8036
8037
8038
8039
8040
8041
8042
8043
8044
8045
8046
8047
8048
8049
8050
8051
8052
8053
8054
8055
8056
8057
8058
8059
8060
8061
8062
8063
8064
8065
8066
8067
8068
8069
8070
8071
8072
8073
8074
8075
8076
8077
8078
8079
8080
8081
8082
8083
8084
8085
8086
8087
8088
8089
8090
8091
8092
8093
8094
8095
8096
8097
8098
8099
80100
80101
80102
80103
80104
80105
80106
80107
80108
80109
80110
80111
80112
80113
80114
80115
80116
80117
80118
80119
80120
80121
80122
80123
80124
80125
80126
80127
80128
80129
80130
80131
80132
80133
80134
80135
80136
80137
80138
80139
80140
80141
80142
80143
80144
80145
80146
80147
80148
80149
80150
80151
80152
80153
80154
80155
80156
80157
80158
80159
80160
80161
80162
80163
80164
80165
80166
80167
80168
80169
80170
80171
80172
80173
80174
80175
80176
80177
80178
80179
80180
80181
80182
80183
80184
80185
80186
80187
80188
80189
80190
80191
80192
80193
80194
80195
80196
80197
80198
80199
80200
80201
80202
80203
80204
80205
80206
80207
80208
80209
80210
80211
80212
80213
80214
80215
80216
80217
80218
80219
80220
80221
80222
80223
80224
80225
80226
80227
80228
80229
80230
80231
80232
80233
80234
80235
80236
80237
80238
80239
80240
80241
80242
80243
80244
80245
80246
80247
80248
80249
80250
80251
80252
80253
80254
80255
80256
80257
80258
80259
80260
80261
80262
80263
80264
80265
80266
80267
80268
80269
80270
80271
80272
80273
80274
80275
80276
80277
80278
80279
80280
80281
80282
80283
80284
80285
80286
80287
80288
80289
80290
80291
80292
80293
80294
80295
80296
80297
80298
80299
80200
80201
80202
80203
80204
80205
80206
80207
80208
80209
80210
80211
80212
80213
80214
80215
80216
80217
80218
80219
80220
80221
80222
80223
80224
80225
80226
80227
80228
80229
80230
80231
80232
80233
80234
80235
80236
80237
80238
80239
80240
80241
80242
80243
80244
80245
80246
80247
80248
80249
80250
80251
80252
80253
80254
80255
80256
80257
80258
80259
80260
80261
80262
80263
80264
80265
80266
80267
80268
80269
80270
80271
80272
80273
80274
80275
80276
80277
80278
80279
80280
80281
80282
80283
80284
80285
80286
80287
80288
80289
80290
80291
80292
80293
80294
80295
80296
80297
80298
80299
80200
80201
80202
80203
80204
80205
80206
80207
80208
80209
80210
80211
80212
80213
80214
80215
80216
80217
80218
80219
80220
80221
80222
80223
80224
80225
80226
80227
80228
80229
80230
80231
80232
80233
80234
80235
80236
80237
80238
80239
80240
80241
80242
80243
80244
80245
80246
80247
80248
80249
80250
80251
80252
80253
80254
80255
80256
80257
80258
80259
80260
80261
80262
80263
80264
80265
80266
80267
80268
80269
80270
80271
80272
80273
80274
80275
80276
80277
80278
80279
80280
80281
80282
80283
80284
80285
80286
80287
80288
80289
80290
80291
80292
80293
80294
80295
80296
80297
80298
80299
80200
80201
80202
80203
80204
80205
80206
80207
80208
80209
80210
80211
80212
80213
80214
80215
80216
80217
80218
80219
80220
80221
80222
80223
80224
80225
80226
80227
80228
80229
80230
80231
80232
80233
80234
80235
80236
80237
80238
80239
80240
80241
80242
80243
80244
80245
80246
80247
80248
80249
80250
80251
80252
80253
80254
80255
80256
80257
80258
80259
80260
80261
80262
80263
80264
80265
80266
80267
80268
80269
80270
80271
80272
80273
80274
80275
80276
80277
80278
80279
80280
80281
80282
80283
80284
80285
80286
80287
80288
80289
80290
80291
80292
80293
80294
80295
80296
80297
80298
80299
80200
80201
80202
80203
80204
80205
80206
80207
80208
80209
80210
80211
80212
80213
80214
80215
80216
80217
80218
80219
80220
80221
80222
80223
80224
80225
80226
80227
80228
80229
80230
80231
80232
80233
80234
80235
80236
80237
80238
80239
80240
80241
80242
80243
80244
80245
80246
80247
80248
80249
80250
80251
80252
80253
80254
80255
80256
80257
80258
80259
80260
80261
80262
80263
80264
80265
80266
80267
80268
80269
80270
80271
80272
80273
80274
80275
80276
80277
80278
80279
80280
80281
80282
80283
80284
80285
80286
80287
80288
80289
80290
80291
80292
80293
80294
80295
80296
80297
80298
80299
80200
80201
80202
80203
80204
80205
80206
80207
80208
80209
80210
80211
80212
80213
80214
80215
80216
80217
80218
80219
80220
80221
80222
80223
80224
80225
80226
80227
80228
80229
80230
80231
80232
80233
80234
80235
80236
80237
80238
80239
80240
80241
80242
80243
80244
80245
80246
80247
80248
80249
80250
80251
80252
80253
80254
80255
80256
80257
80258
80259
80260
80261
80262
80263
80264
80265
80266
80267
80268
80269
80270
80271
80272
80273
80274
80275
80276
80277
80278
80279
80280
80281
80282
80283
80284
80285
80286
80287
80288
80289
80290
80291
80292
80293
80294
80295
80296
80297
80298
80299
80200
80201
80202
80203
80204
80205
80206
80207
80208
80209
80210
80211
80212
80213
80214
80215
80216
80217
80218
80219
80220
80221
80222
80223
80224
80225
80226
80227
80228
80229
80230
80231
80232
80233
80234
80235
80236
80237
80238
80239
80240
80241
80242
80243
80244
80245
80246
80247
80248
80249
80250
80251
80252
80253
80254
80255
80256
80257
80258
80259
80260
80261
80262
80263
80264
80265
80266
80267
80268
80269
80270
80271
80272
80273
80274
80275
80276
80277
80278
80279
80280
80281
80282
80283
80284
80285
80286
80287
80288
80289
80290
80291
80292
80293
80294
80295
80296
80297
80298
80299
80200
80201
80202
80203
80204
80205
80206
80207
80208
80209
80210
80211
80212
80213
80214
80215
80216
80217
80218
80219
80220
80221
80222
80223
80224
80225
80226
80227
80228
80229
80230
80231
80232
80233
80234
80235
80236
80237
80238
80239
80240
80241
80242
80243
80244
80245
80246

1 Plaintiff alleges Judges Chen and Freeman engaged in “ex
 2 parte communications” with Siereveld and Simkins “prior to” being
 3 assigned his cases.³ (*Id.* at 7:27-28, 9:2-3.) He alleges that “as a
 4 result” of the ex parte communications with Siereveld, Judges Chen
 5 and Freeman “attacked the *in forma pauperis* and the ability of
 Plaintiff[] to pay the filing fees in these cases to deny him access to
 6 the courts.” (*Id.* at 9:24-27.) Plaintiff alleges Judges Chen and
 7 Freeman “fabricated accounts of [his] pleadings in an effort to
 8 railroad him out of court.” (*Id.* at 5:24-26.)

9 (ECF No. 23 at 1:21-3:6 (footnotes in original).)

10 After finding Plaintiff had seven prior “strike” dismissals within the meaning of 28 U.S.C.
 11 § 1915(g), the Court also concluded Plaintiff had not alleged he fell within that statute’s
 12 “imminent danger” exception. (*Id.* at 4-6.)

13 DISCUSSION

14 I. Motion for Reconsideration

15 A. Legal Standard

16 When, as here, a court’s ruling has not resulted in a final judgment or order,
 17 reconsideration of the ruling may be sought under Rule 54(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil
 18 Procedure, which provides that any order which does not terminate the action is subject to revision
 19 at any time before the entry of judgment. Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b). “Reconsideration is appropriate if
 20 the district court (1) is presented with newly discovered evidence, (2) committed clear error or the
 21 initial decision was manifestly unjust, or (3) if there is an intervening change in controlling law.”
22 School Dist. No. 1J v. ACandS, Inc., 5 F.3d 1255, 1263 (9th Cir. 1993).

23 In the Northern District of California, no motion for reconsideration may be brought
 24 without leave of court. Civil L.R. 7-9(a). Under Civil Local Rule 7-9, the moving party must
 25 specifically show:

26 (1) That at the time of the motion for leave, a material difference in
 27 fact or law exists from that which was presented to the court before
 28 entry of the interlocutory order for which the reconsideration is
 sought, and that in the exercise of reasonable diligence the party
 applying for reconsideration did not know such fact or law at the time
 of the interlocutory order; or

(2) The emergence of new material facts or a change of law occurring

29 ³ The cases are *Akers v. Siereveld*, No. 17-03340-EMC (PR), and *Akers v. Chen, et al.*, No. 22-
 05555-BLF (PR).

1 after the time of such order; or

2 (3) A manifest failure by the Court to consider material facts which
3 were presented to the Court before such interlocutory order.

4 Civil L.R. 7-9(b).

5 **B. Analysis**

6 Plaintiff does not dispute the Court's determination that he has three or more "strikes"
7 within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). Instead, he makes several arguments for
8 reconsideration of the Court's conclusion that the "imminent danger" exception to Section 1915(g)
does not apply to this case.

9 Section 1915(g) provides a prisoner may not bring a civil action or appeal a judgment in a
10 civil action or proceeding under 28 U.S.C. § 1915 (i.e., may not proceed IFP)

11 if the prisoner has, on 3 or more prior occasions, while incarcerated
12 or detained in any facility, brought an action or appeal in a court of
13 the United States that was dismissed on the grounds that it is
frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may
be granted, unless the prisoner is under imminent danger of serious
physical injury.

14 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).

15 As explained in the OSC:

16 The plain language of the imminent danger clause in Section
17 1915(g) indicates that "imminent danger" is to be assessed at the
time of filing of the complaint. *See Andrews v. Cervantes*, 493 F.3d
1047, 1053 (9th Cir. 2007) ("Andrews II"). The conditions that
existed at some earlier or later time are not relevant. *Id.* at 1053 &
n.5. The court "should not make an overly detailed inquiry into
whether the allegations qualify for the exception." *Id.* at 1055. It is
sufficient if the complaint "makes a plausible allegation that the
prisoner faced 'imminent danger of serious physical injury' at the
time of filing." *Id.* at 1055; *see, e.g., Ashley v. Dilworth*, 147 F.3d
715, 717 (8th Cir. 1998) (imminent danger based upon allegations
plaintiff had been repeatedly housed near enemies, despite his
protests, and where he filed his complaint very shortly after being
attacked by an enemy); *Abdul-Akbar v. McKelvie*, 239 F.3d 307, 315
n.1 (3d Cir. 2001) (en banc) (noting that the plaintiff's allegations of
past acts of physical harassment were not sufficiently specific or
related to support an inference of an ongoing danger).

25 (ECF No. 23 at 5:6-17.)

26 The Court concluded Plaintiff made no "plausible allegation that he faced 'imminent
27 danger of serious physical injury' under Section 1915(g) at the time he filed the complaint." (*Id.* at
28

1 5:18-19):

2 His allegations that Siereveld, Conover, and Hill prevented
 3 him from paying court filing fees,⁴ that Siereveld “destroyed” his
 4 relationships with members of his community by referring to him as
 5 a “terrorist” (ECF No. 22 at 9:20-21), that Siereveld and Simkins
 6 engaged in ex parte communications with federal judges, that
 7 various Defendants interfered with his mail, and that federal judges
 8 improperly revoked his IFP status and “railroad[ed]” him out of
 9 court (*id.* at 5:13), do not pose a danger of *physical* injury. Plaintiff’s
 10 allegation that he was “retaliated against by being threatened with
 11 bodily harm” is vague and conclusory insofar as he does not allege
 12 who made these threats, when they were made, or the nature of the
 13 threats. Similarly Plaintiff’s allegation that Simkins and Hill “ha[ve]
 14 been instrumental” in “trying to make sure that Plaintiff’s
 15 medication is not given to him” (*id.* at 7:6-7) is vague as to when
 16 that occurred, for how long, and the kind of medication he did not
 17 receive. His allegation that “that he will be denied emergency care
 18 for his condition, atrial fibrillation” (*id.* at 7:7-8) is simply
 19 speculative and vague because he alleges no facts indicating when
 20 he needed or will need emergency care or that he has a reasonable
 21 basis for believing he will not receive it if and when it is needed.
 22 And his allegation that Simkins and Hill “tried to orchestrate” his
 23 “assault[] by U.S. Marshal personnel” (*id.* at 7:6-11) is vague in that
 24 Plaintiff does not allege when that occurred, what Defendants did to
 25 “orchestrate it,” or facts suggesting a danger such an attempt will be
 26 repeated. Consequently, Plaintiff has not alleged facts that plausibly
 27 indicate he faced an “imminent danger of serious physical injury”⁵
 28 under Section 1915(g) when he filed this action.⁵

16 (*Id.* at 5:19-6:13 (emphasis and footnotes, as renumbered, in original).)

17 Plaintiff argues the Court “did not rule on or entertain the fact the Plaintiff was subject to
 18 physical and psychological torture at the time of the filing of the complaint and the amended
 19 complaint.” (ECF No. 24-1 at 8.)⁶ This argument fails because the OSC addressed Plaintiff’s
 20 allegations of “physical and psychological torture” by determining the alleged “torture” is not
 21 physical at all insofar as it consists of Defendants allegedly ruining his relationships and telling
 22 lies about him to his “relations” and people in his “community.” (ECF No. 23 at 2:9-12.) The
 23 OSC went on to explain that such allegations do not present “a danger of *physical* injury” as

24
 25 ⁴ In *Siereveld*, the court persuasively explained in detail why Plaintiff’s assertion that he was being
 26 prevented from accessing resources to pay his filing fee was not credible. No. 17-3[3]40-EMC
 27 (PR) (ECF No. [21 at] 5:4-7:28).

⁵ The Court notes similar allegations and claims were found insufficient to plausibly allege an
 28 imminent danger of serious physical injury in *Chen*, No. 22-05555-BLF (ECF Nos. 12 at 4:26-
 6:21; 24 at 6:13-20).

⁶ The instant order cites to docket entry 24-1 because it contains the motion with the pages in the
 consecutive order. (*Cf.* ECF No. 24 (pages not in consecutive order).)

1 required to meet the “imminent danger” under Section 1915(g). (*Id.* at 5:19-24 (emphasis in
2 original).)

3 Plaintiff cites to *Grant v. Foye*, 1992 WL 371312 (9th Cir. 1992), for the proposition that
4 “acts that amount to wanton infliction of psychological torture are redressable under 42 U.S.C. §
5 1983.” (ECF No. 24-1 at 9.) *Grant* is not persuasive that the OSC should be reconsidered because
6 it addressed the elements of a claim under Section 1983, and it did not address Section 1915(g) or
7 its “imminent danger” exception. That “psychological torture” may support a claim for relief
8 under Section 1983 does not mean it constitutes “physical injury” within the meaning of Section
9 1915(g).

10 Plaintiff also argues the OSC “mischaracterized the record” (*id.* at 9-10) because it cited a
11 decision in one of Plaintiff’s prior cases without “supply[ing] any text of any ruling . . . to buttress
12 [the Court’s] inaccurate findings that plaintiff has not been prevented from accessing his finances
13 to pay the filing fee.” (*Id.* at 10.) The Court stated:

14 In *Siereveld*, the court persuasively explained in detail why
15 Plaintiff’s assertion that he was being prevented from accessing
16 resources to pay his filing fee was not credible. No. 17-3[3]40-EMC
(PR) (ECF No. [21 at] 5:4-7:28).

17 (ECF No. 23 at 5 n.3.)⁷ The Court does not have any obligation to quote or supply the text of an
18 order cited from another case, particularly an order previously served upon Plaintiff, such as the
19 order in *Siereveld*.⁸

20 Plaintiff also asserts the “complaint specifies he was denied emergency treatment for four
21 months for a/fib.” (ECF No. 24-1 at 12 n.2.) This allegation is vague because he alleges no facts
22 indicating when such care was denied. Moreover, as in the OSC, Plaintiff does not allege here that
23 at the time he filed this action he needed emergency care but was not receiving it. As explained in

24
25 ⁷ The citation to *Siereveld* did not use the correct case number and docket entry. (See ECF No. 23
26 at 5 n.3.) That error is corrected here. The incorrect citation in the OSC is not “material” (Civil
27 L.R. 7-9(b)) insofar as it does not diminish the persuasiveness of the *Siereveld* order’s analysis and
28 conclusion that Plaintiff was not credibly prevented from accessing resources to pay the filing fee,
nor is the mis-citation relevant to the determination under Section 1915(g) that Plaintiff has more
than three “strikes” and does not meet the imminent danger exception.

⁸ Plaintiff may obtain another copy of the order by submitting a request for photocopies to the
Office of the Clerk.

1 the OSC, this allegation therefore does not indicate that at the time he filed this action he was
2 under “imminent danger of serious physical injury” under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).

3 Finally, Plaintiff asserts “Defendants have been removed from their respective positions
4 for misconduct in this and other cases around the United States.” (*Id.* at 13.) These alleged facts
5 are not relevant to the issues raised in the OSC, namely whether Section 1915(g) bars him from
6 proceeding IFP because he has three “strikes” and was not under imminent danger of serious
7 physical injury when he filed this case.

8 Plaintiff is not entitled to reconsideration of the OSC because he has not presented new
9 “material” facts or law, “newly discovered evidence,” or shown “clear error,” “manifest” injustice,
10 or “an intervening change in controlling law.” *See* Civil Local Rule 7-9; *School Dist. No. 1J*, 5
11 F.3d at 1263.

12 2. Response to OSC

13 In his response to the OSC, Plaintiff argues his allegations of “physical and psychological
14 torture” are sufficient to show cause why leave to proceed IFP should not be revoked under
15 Section 1915(g). For the reasons discussed above, these allegations do not support a plausible
16 inference he was under imminent danger of physical injury at the time he filed this case, as
17 required by Section 1915(g). The response to the OSC alleges no additional facts showing he was
18 under such imminent danger. Accordingly, Plaintiff has not shown cause why leave to proceed
19 IFP should not be revoked under Section 1915(g). Nor has he paid the filing fee. Therefore, as
20 Plaintiff was cautioned in the OSC, leave to proceed IFP must be revoked and this case dismissed
21 without prejudice. (*See* ECF No. 23 at 1:16-19, 6:15-17.)

22 **CONCLUSION**

23 For the above reasons, the motion for reconsideration (ECF No. 24) is DENIED, leave to
24 proceed IFP is REVOKED under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g), and the case is DISMISSED without
25 prejudice to Plaintiff filing his complaint in a new case in which he pays the filing fee.

26 This order resolves docket number 24.

27 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

28 Dated: October 16, 2024

United States District Court
Northern District of California

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Jacqueline Scott Corley
JACQUELINE SCOTT CORLEY
United States District Judge